



ALAMEDA COUNTY  
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY

---

1333 BROADWAY, SUITE 220 • OAKLAND, CA 94612 • PHONE: (510) 836-2560 • FAX: (510) 836-2185  
E-MAIL: [mail@accma.ca.gov](mailto:mail@accma.ca.gov) • WEB SITE: [accma.ca.gov](http://accma.ca.gov)

**Memorandum**

*June 8, 2009  
Agenda Item 3.3  
Handout*

**Date:** June 2, 2009  
**To:** Plans and Programs Committee  
**From:** Beth Walukas, Manager of Planning  
**Subject:** 2008 Countywide Transportation Plan

**Action**

The Board is requested to approve the revisions to the 2008 Countywide Transportation Plan. The revisions are necessary to be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, T2035, adopted by MTC on April 22, 2009. Upon approval by the Board, the Plan will be revised, printed and distributed, and posted on the website. The revisions to Chapter 5 Revenue and Chapter 6 Capital Investment Program are attached. Revisions to Chapter 2 Existing Conditions, the Executive Summary and Appendices are also being updated to be current with the most recently adopted Performance Report and congestion data.

**Discussion**

In June 2008, the CMA Board adopted the 2008 Countywide Transportation Plan with the condition that the Plan may need to be revised once the Regional Transportation Plan, T2035, was completed by MTC. MTC did adopt Resolution 3893, Final Transportation 2035 Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area on April 22, 2009. Staff has updated the 2008 Countywide Transportation Plan to be consistent the T2035. The most substantive changes are to the revenue estimates. The revisions are shown in strikeout and bold in the attached Chapters 5 and 6. A summary of the changes is also shown in the Table below.

Revisions to Chapter 2 Existing Conditions, the Executive Summary and Appendices are also being updated to be current with the most recently adopted Performance Report and congestion data. Because these reports have already been reviewed by the Committees and the Board, they are not attached.

**Comparison of Tier 2 (Table 6.4) Discretionary Funds in the 2008 Countywide Transportation Plan to T2035 2009 Adopted Revenues**

Area	2009 Adopted T2035		Explanation of changes	2008 CWTP Estimate	
	PA	%		PA	%
Multi-jurisdiction	\$240.9	27	\$7 (1)	\$233.9	26
Planning Area 1	\$210.1	24	\$24 (2)	\$186.1	21
Planning Area 2	\$115.1	13	\$0.0	\$115.1	13
Planning Area 3	\$199.2	23	-\$30.8 (3)	\$230.0	26
Planning Area 4	\$117.3	13	-\$15.7 (4)	\$133.0	15
Total	\$882.6	100	-\$15.5	\$898.1	100

(1) Project 1 AC Transit Telegraph/International/E. 14th decreased \$11 million and Project 4 Additional buses for Frequent Service Transit Network increased \$18 million per Resolution 3434.

(2) Project 10 AC Transit Grand/MacArthur BRT increased \$24 million per Resolution 3434.

(3) Project 48 BART Warm Springs Extension decreased \$16 million and Project 52 Dumbarton Rail Rail Corridor decreased \$14.8 million per Resolution 3434. As a result, for Project 52, \$301.0 million was added to Table 6.1 Committed for environmental, design, and right-of-way.

(4) Per Resolution 3434, Project 57 I-580 Right of way preservation for transit was moved to Table 6.1 Committed, a net reduction of \$11 million in Tier 2, and LAVTA's Livermore/Dublin Bus Rapid Transit was also moved to Table 6.1 Committed, a net reduction of \$5 million. Project 66 PSR development for SR 84 Widening Pigeon Pass to I-680 was increased \$0.3 million.

Countywide  
Transportation Plan  
**2008**

ALAMEDA COUNTY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY

## CHAPTER 5 **Revenue**

This chapter provides an overview of the revenues and funding sources available to finance transportation improvements in Alameda County. The CMA has adopted goals to increase transit use, reduce congestion and pollution, maintain the existing system, contribute to the economic vitality of the County and coordinate transportation and land use planning. After reviewing the available funding sources, it is clear that additional revenue mechanisms must be established.

### **WHY FUNDING IS LIMITED**

Funding is limited in two ways: revenues have not matched the growth of the population—creating a revenue shortfall; and present revenue sources lack the flexibility needed to respond to changing local needs.

Revenue collections did not keep pace with County population growth because of the California recession in the early 2000's and because the state gasoline tax has not been adjusted to account for the impacts of inflation.

Revenue flexibility continues to be a problem because so many revenue sources can only be used for capital investment purposes. A common thread in reviewing historical and current fund sources is the availability of dollars for capital investments versus the availability of operating funds. It is far easier to obtain funding to build a road than it is to maintain it; for transit it is easier to buy a bus than it is to obtain the funds to operate it. Given the CMA's goals of maintaining the existing transportation system, reducing congestion and air pollution and increasing transit use, the funding of transit operations and local road maintenance continue to be critical issues.

**Many revenue  
sources can  
only be used  
for capital  
investment  
purposes.**

To a large degree the lack of funding for maintenance and transit operation is dictated by the types of, and limitations on, funding sources. For example, some funding sources are specific for highways, while others are specific for transit capital projects. Restrictions on fund sources can lead project sponsors and the CMA to make investment decisions based on funding source requirements and availability rather than on need. The result is a challenge to develop and maintain a balanced transportation network that meets the needs of local communities and ensures mobility as well as regional connectivity.

### **A NEW APPROACH TO APPROPRIATING FUNDS**

Historically, the CMA budget funds for the Investment Plan through a formula based on population; funds were divided among four geographically defined planning areas. However, in 2008 the CMA embarked on a new approach. The financially constrained investments were divided in two tiers: Tier 1

consists of High Priority Projects and Tier 2 is generally based on projects and programs identified by the planning areas. The total budget for Tiers 1 and 2 is based on the amount of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds that are expected over the 25-year planning period. The CMA Board adopted the assumption that all federal funds would be available to operate and maintain the existing system as well as MTC's Regional Programs.

High priority projects are those projects that provide congestion relief, improve mobility or connectivity and extend beyond a single area. In 2008, a new criterion was added: those projects that were included in the 2004 Plan and not fully funded. As noted in Chapter 6, these projects are the East Bay Bus Rapid Transit, BART Warm Springs extension and I-580 Corridor Improvements. In 2008, two new programs are identified as High Priority Projects: Access Improvements to support TOD and arterial performance initiative.

Together, Tier 1 and Tier 2 contain only projects that can be funded by the 25-year forecasted revenue from the STIP.

## **AVAILABLE FUNDING SOURCES**

The transportation needs in the County are diverse. They require flexible funding sources that allow transportation improvements and services to be tailored to local requirements, including:

- Maintaining and operating the existing system;
- Managing the transportation system; and
- Developing new facilities.

Funds must be flexible enough to meet the varied needs of older cities, developing suburbs and the demands of people and freight movement, as well as demands for highway improvements and transit. Flexibility in the use of funding is a critical aspect of the CMA's challenge to develop and maintain a balanced County transportation network.

Federal, state and local funds are generally available for the following purposes:

- Highway construction, improvements and maintenance\*
- Local street and road improvements and maintenance
- Transit capital projects and operating subsidies\*
- Operational improvements using new and advanced technologies
- Congestion pricing
- Improvements to support TOD, such as replacement parking and bicycle and pedestrian improvements

- Strategies to reduce greenhouse gases
- Bridge replacement and rehabilitation
- Paratransit
- \* Highway maintenance and transit operating funds do not come under the purview of the CMA.

Funds for freeway, local streets and transit capital projects have been easier to obtain than funds for transit operating subsidies. Federal legislation has provided additional flexibility in programming road and transit capital funds, but funds for transit operations have not been able to keep up with demand for such service.

Policies regarding clean air, reduction in greenhouse gases and reduced freeway congestion rely on the availability of transit as an alternative mode. Funds for maintaining existing transit services, however, have eroded and funds for new services are severely limited.

Funding sources available for both ongoing and new projects and programs include:

- TEA-21<sup>1</sup>
- State gas tax subventions to local government
- State Transportation Development Act (TDA)/State Transit Assistance (STA) revenues
- STIP funds
- State Environmental Enhancements and Mitigation
- State Proposition 1B funds
- STDA, Article 3 – Bicycle and Pedestrian
- State Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) for specific projects
- Bridge Toll Revenues
- Regional Measure 2 (RM 2), bridge toll revenues for specific projects and programs
- Measure B Half-Cent Sales Tax Program
- AB 1107 half-cent sales tax revenues for transit (BART and AC Transit)

---

<sup>1</sup> TEA-21 was approved in June 1998 and covers a six-year period. This Plan assumes that federal transportation funds will continue to flow to the Bay Area and Alameda County at the same level as in the past.

- Vehicle registration fees for clean air programs, called the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA), in the Bay Area
- Local fees paid by developers to reduce the negative impacts of their developments on traffic

Revenue sources available to Alameda County are not enough to achieve the CMA’s transportation vision for the future.

## HOW MUCH DOES THE CMA EXPECT?

The MTC ~~adopted the regional transportation plan, entitled *Transportation 2035* on April 22, 2009.~~ This document is MTC’s long-range planning document that covers a 25-year period (from 2010 to 2035). In developing *Transportation 2035* by State law, MTC must consider county transportation plans. For Alameda County, the CMA’s *2008 Countywide Transportation Plan* includes Tier 1 projects—those projects that can fit into the total amount of funding that the CMA expects from federal, state and local sources over the next 25 years.

Deleted: is currently updating

Deleted: .

Deleted: E

Deleted: ,

Deleted: t

MTC estimates that \$21~~8~~ billion will be available for the region over the 25-year period. Of this amount:

Deleted: 22

- Approximately \$18~~6~~ billion is committed to the existing system; and

Deleted: 91

- Approximately \$32~~4~~ billion is available for new investment.

Deleted: 1

The revenues are significantly higher than in previous regional transportation plans because the assumptions are less conservative; revenues are escalated and HOT Lane revenues have been included. Concurrent with the escalation of revenues, project costs will also be escalated.

MTC will include a financially-constrained alternative in *Transportation 2035*, corresponding to the estimated \$21~~8~~ billion of expected revenue. MTC will also include (among other alternatives), a “Vision” Element. This alternative is based on new revenues that could become available from new sources, such as a regional fuel tax, extension of the half cent sales tax and/or a per VMT tax. This plan includes projects for consideration in the Vision.

Deleted: 22

## Commitment to the Existing System

As shown in Table 5.1, revenue sources at all levels of government are dedicated to operation and maintenance of the existing transportation system. Maintaining, rehabilitating and managing the County transportation system requires an increasing financial commitment that, at a minimum, ensures its safety, reliability and existing service levels. If maintenance is deferred, the result is a substantial and increasing maintenance backlog. The commitment to these projects and programs are made prior to determining how funds should be allocated to “new” projects. **Table 5.1—Committed Funds in *Transportation 2035*** (\$ in billions)

DEDICATED USE	FED	STATE	REGION	LOCAL	TOTAL
Transit Operation and Maintenance	15	9	14	66	104
Roads Operation and Maintenance	3	22	9	17	51
Transit Expansion	5	3	2	15	25
Road Expansion/Other	0	4	0	2	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>186</b>

Source: Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Note: Values rounded to the nearest one-half billion

### Revenues Available for New Investment

MTC has identified a target of \$7.1 billion in discretionary funds for Alameda County for the 25-year planning horizon. There has been no clear direction on amount of funds from the traditional State and Federal transportation sources. Further, as noted previously, net HOT Lane toll revenues (\$ 6.1 Billion) will be included in the financial projections for the first time.

The CMA Board adopted the policy that all federal funds (STP, CMAQ) would be allocated for maintenance of local streets and roads and transit capital replacement; in 2005, this amounted to \$2 billion. In addition, the financially constrained plan would assume the 25-year forecasted revenues from the State Transportation Improvement Program amounting to \$1,123 million and HOT Lane revenues would equal \$1.7 billion. The balance of funds in the MTC revenue estimates are from unknown sources.

### Proposition 1B Revenues

Recognizing the significant need to improve the transportation infrastructure, California voters approved Proposition 1B in 2006 which allowed the State to issue revenue bonds for transportation improvements. This is the first new State revenue source for transportation improvements since the TCRP was approved in 2000. Proposition 1B provided \$20 billion statewide for additional transportation projects in the following categories:

- Congestion Reduction, Highway and Local Road Improvements ..... \$11.25 billion
- Public Transportation..... \$4.0 billion
- Goods Movement and Air Quality..... \$3.2 billion
- Safety and Security ..... \$1.475 billion

In general, the projects for the bond revenues are selected by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) based on approved criteria. Therefore, the total revenues that will be committed to Alameda County are unknown. However, Alameda County received more than \$500 million in the Congestion Mitigation Improvement Program (CMIP) in 2006 and almost \$500 million in the Trade Corridor

Deleted: 7
Deleted: 71
Deleted: 111
Deleted: 0
Deleted: 12
Deleted: 10.5
Deleted: 18
Deleted: .5
Deleted: 3
Deleted: 1.5
Deleted: 0.5
Deleted: 17
Deleted: 22
Deleted: 1
Deleted: .5
Deleted: 7.5
Deleted: 7.5
Deleted: 108.5
Deleted: 192



Improvement Program in April 2008 (\$359 for Port of Oakland Projects, \$73 million for I-880 improvements and \$64 million for the I-580 truck climbing lane).

In addition to money programmed through *Transportation 2035*, the County also expects to receive funding from Measure B<sup>2</sup>, RM 2<sup>3</sup>, TDA Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds, TCRP funds, State Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) funds, and a share of New Starts funding.

## REVENUE ISSUES

There are both opportunities and constraints with current and future revenue sources. Table 5.2 identifies future revenue sources and outlines issues that must be resolved in developing a strategic financial program.

The TCRP, approved by the State Legislature in 2000, provided additional funds for specific projects throughout California. Approximately \$115 million was identified for projects in Alameda County. However, California's budget crisis has resulted in the lack of funding for some of the TCRP projects, making it likely that not all of the funding will be available and that some projects will not receive these funds.

HOT Lane revenues are assumed in MTC's estimates, however there is no history of HOT Lanes in northern California; therefore it is uncertain at this time how much revenue can be generated. In addition, MTC has discussed a policy that HOT Lane revenues from one corridor may be spent on improvements in another corridor or County. Public opinion polls conducted by the CMA indicate that there is public support for HOT Lanes provided the revenues from the HOT Lane are linked to improvements that benefit the corridor. Transferring funds from one corridor to another could jeopardize the success of HOT Lanes.

**Funding of  
transit operations  
and local road  
maintenance  
continue to be  
critical issues.**

While other fund sources may be available, the amount of funding is tied to economic conditions. Therefore the total amount of funds available for future programming can be uncertain. Under such conditions, the CMA will have to determine the best strategy to establish additional revenue mechanisms. Each source presents a series of challenges and opportunities. The CMA must assess which sources are most viable given the national,

---

<sup>2</sup> To add to state and federal dollars, Alameda County voters recognized the importance of providing a local contribution to transportation improvements. In 2000, voters approved Measure B, which continued the half-cent sales tax on gasoline. Funds generated by Measure B will be used in combination with County Share funds shown in Tier 1, as well as for other projects.

<sup>3</sup> RM 2, approved by Bay Area Voters in March 2004, increased the tolls on Bay Area bridges by \$1.00. The revenues are dedicated for specific capital projects and operating funds for selected transit operators.

state and regional economy and possible need for voter approval. In the past, Alameda County voters have demonstrated willingness to pay for improvements to the transportation network. It is not expected, however, that all of these revenue sources will be secured.

To deliver the Vision projects in the future, the CMA must assess the feasibility of new revenue mechanisms.

**Table 5.2—Future Revenue Sources and Potential Issues**

---

**Regional Gas Tax <sup>4</sup>**

- 10-cent gas tax would generate \$940 million over 25 years in Alameda County.
- Voter approval needed for nine Bay Area County tax and expenditure plan; requires two-thirds vote.
- Regional gas tax expenditure plan developed by MTC in consultation with CMA.
- Uses to be specified in measure (road, transit, paratransit, capital projects and operating subsidies).
- Revenue estimate tied to fuel use; including estimate of revenue generated by zero-emission fuels.
- Inflation impact (project costs may escalate above revenue generated).

---

**County Gas Tax <sup>5</sup>**

- 10-cent gas tax would generate \$940 over 25 years in Alameda County.
- With enabling legislation, CMA (and adjoining counties) could develop gas tax proposal and expenditure plan for voter approval; requires two-thirds majority vote.
- Uses to be specified in measure (road, transit, paratransit capital projects and operating subsidies), as determined by CMA and local jurisdictions.
- Revenue estimated tied to fuel use; including estimate of revenue generated by zero-emission fuels.
- Inflation impact (project costs may escalate above revenue generated).

---

**Additional Surcharge on Bridge Tolls**

- Legislative approval is required.

---

<sup>4</sup> AB 595 (Brown), approved by the State Legislature in 1997, authorizes the MTC to impose a tax of up to 10 cents per gallon on gasoline sold in the Bay Area. The legislation requires that 95 percent of the revenues be “returned to source” based on County population, meaning that 95 percent of the money raised from this tax in Alameda County will be returned to the County.

<sup>5</sup> Individual counties may also impose a gas tax, in one-cent-per-gallon increments, with no lifetime limit. A proposition must be submitted to the voters. Placement on the ballot requires a written agreement between the cities and the County on an expenditure plan.

- Would vary depending on volume of traffic on bridges.
- Inflation would impact with fixed fee.

---

#### Traffic Congestion Relief Program

- Requires legislative approval.
- Inflation impact (project costs may escalate above revenue generated).
- Revenue tied to fuel use.
- Subject to fluctuating economic conditions.

---

#### Incremental Increase in Fuel Tax

- One-cent per gallon increase in the gas tax per year would generate \$1.6 billion over 20 years in Alameda County.
- Under existing legislation, Alameda County (and other Bay Area counties) could receive an additional penny per gallon per year.
- Uses include road, transit, paratransit capital projects and operating subsidies.
- Revenue estimated tied to fuel use, including estimate of revenue generated by zero-emission fuels.
- Inflation impact (project costs may escalate above revenue generated).
- Subject to fluctuating economic conditions.

---

#### Development Impact Fees

- Specified project list determines amount of revenue required to be generated.
- Impact fee calculated based on projected residential and commercial development.
- Nexus between fee and projects must be established.
- Agreement on fee program among local jurisdictions and CMA must be established.
- Only local jurisdictions can adopt fee structure and collect revenues.
- Not used for maintenance.
- Are difficult to use for transit capital projects and almost impossible for transit operating support (a shuttle bus might be required of a developer as a condition of development approval but not included in the determination of the impact fee).
- Applies only to new development, minimal revenue generated in built-out areas.
- Subject to fluctuating economic conditions.

## **Advocacy for Transit Operating Funds**

In developing the funding equity formula and the *2008 Countywide Transportation Plan*, it was clear that both capital and operating fund sources for transit are insufficient to immediately develop the desired County transit network. In particular, the lack of transit operating subsidies is hampering and will continue to obstruct the CMA's stated goal to "improve transit access and increase transit use." The CMA will address this critical need by advocating additional and reliable funding for transit operations.

## **Advocacy for Operating and Maintenance Funds for New Technology**

The CMA has invested a significant amount of funds to implement the SMART Corridors program throughout Alameda County. The funds have been allocated to the capital components of the program. Additional funds are needed to provide for ongoing operations of the program as well as funding for maintenance. These funds are critical to ensure that the investments are maintained.

## **SUMMARY OF REVENUE POLICIES**

The CMA will use the following policies to address the competing demands for revenues necessary to finance the CMA's vision of the future.

1. Support establishing a stable revenue source that sustains transit service identified in this Plan.
2. Support establishing a stable revenue source for maintenance and rehabilitation of local streets and roads identified in this Plan.
3. Support increased flexibility in using existing revenue to apply funds to capital, operating or maintenance, as the need dictates.
4. Support the policy that requires that HOT Lane revenues generated in a corridor to be used first for the operation and maintenance of the HOT Lanes and that the remaining net revenues generated in a corridor be available for transit vehicles and operations service the corridor (50 percent) and for capital investments (50 percent) with HOT Lane extensions in the corridor given priority.
5. Support increased revenues for transportation purposes that may include one or a combination of the following:
  - Additional surcharge on toll bridges
  - Countywide or regional gas tax
  - Countywide or regional vehicle registration fee
  - Local development impact fees
  - Incremental increases to the state fuel tax
6. Endorse the concept of a state constitutional amendment that would enable the voters of Alameda County and other counties to approve transportation sales tax measures by simple majority.

## CHAPTER 6    **Capital Investment Program**

The CMA's capital investment program (CIP) represents a series of projects and programs intended to maintain and enhance Alameda County's transportation system. The CMA must make strategic investment choices to balance maintenance and expansion of the core transportation system to accommodate future population and job growth.

### **INVESTMENT POLICIES**

The CMA capital investment policies recognize a responsibility to future generations while taking a combination of other steps necessary to:

- Maintain and operate existing facilities before diverting funds to build new facilities.
- Focus on high priority projects over the next several state and federal funding cycles to ensure delivery of these improvements.
- Give priority to projects that are most effectively coordinated with land use planning, with special focus on Priority Development Areas (PDAs).
- Encourage the purchase of alternative fuel transit vehicles to the greatest extent possible given financial constraints.
- Support strategies that reduce transportation's share of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Implement incentives for transit use, ride sharing and more efficient use of existing roads.
- Ensure that regional gateways are safely operated to manage traffic flow and, where appropriate, gives priority to the movement of carpools, buses and commercial vehicles.
- Ensure that no individual project is so costly that it compromises the improvement of the system as a whole.
- Secure additional funding for a CIP that meets priority needs as economically as possible.
- Ensure routine accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists as identified in MTC Resolution 3765 (Appendix J) and included in the 2006 Alameda Countywide Bicycle Plan.

### **FUNDING CHALLENGES**

Using estimates developed by MTC for the regional transportation plan (RTP), or *Transportation 2035*, the core capital investment plan is "financially constrained." Consequently, Tiers 1 and 2 can only contain projects that fit into the total amount of funding the CMA expects to be available from federal, state and local sources over the next 25 years. These sources include:

- STP/CMAQ
- STIP

- ITIP
- State transportation revenue bonds
- Other federal and state funds
- TDA funds
- Alameda County's transportation sales tax (Measure B)
- Local funds, such as development fees

MTC estimates that ~~\$218~~ **224** billion in local, regional, state and federal funding will be available for transportation purposes for the 25-year planning period. Eighty percent, or ~~\$186~~ **194** billion, has been committed to previous projects and programs, leaving ~~\$32~~ **30** billion available regionwide for other projects or programs. The revenues appear much larger than in previous regional transportation plans because they are escalated based on new federal requirements.

In addition to the traditional transportation funds that are assumed for the RTP, MTC has assumed revenues from future HOT Lanes. MTC estimated that Alameda County HOT Lanes would generate approximately \$1.7 billion over the 25-year planning period. The total amount of funds from all sources available for projects and programs in Alameda County is \$7.1 billion.

Although the amount of funds Alameda County expects to receive seems to be large, it is not enough to pay for all of Alameda County's transportation needs. The Measure B half-cent sales tax extension will provide additional funding, but still does not address all the needs.

## **CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAM**

The CIP serves as the basis for Alameda County's recommendation for the 2009 regional transportation plan, *Transportation 2035*. The investments are presented in five parts:

- Committed Projects
- Tier 1 Investments (five high priority projects)
- Tier 2 Investments (recommended by the planning areas)
- Tier 3 Investments (ITIP, State bond project candidates and projects for HOT Lane revenues)
- Tier 4 Investments (Vision projects should new funds be identified)

## Committed Projects

Table 6.1 lists the Committed Projects for Alameda County. These are projects that meet one of the following criteria approved by MTC for *Transportation 2035*:

- Locally generated and locally subvented funds stipulated by law are committed whether or not their programs or projects are fully funded.
- Projects or project elements fully funded in the first four programming years of the most current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Transportation funds used to maintain and operate existing road and transit systems as programmed in the current TIP, specified by law or defined by MTC policy.
- Ongoing regional operations programs—TransLink®, 511, FSP/Call Box, Freeway Operations, Arterial Signal Timing, Performance Monitoring, PTAP/TETAP, Transit Connectivity (10-year commitment)—would continue to be operated/funded as they are currently. Regional program enhancements would not be committed.

For purposes of the *Countywide Transportation Plan*, Committed Projects will only include those meeting the first three criteria. Funding for the regional programs are beyond the purview of the CMA.

**Table 6.1—Committed Projects** (\$ millions of 2007)

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	COST
1	CMA	Widen I-680 for southbound HOV/HOT lane from SR-237 to SR-84 (includes ramp metering and auxiliary lane)	In Santa Clara and Alameda Counties on I-680 from SR-237 to Stoneridge Drive to construct HOV lanes from SR-237 to SR-84, ramp metering throughout the project limits, and auxiliary lanes at selected locations. Project includes HOT Lanes and rehabilitation of the roadway.	<b>230.9</b> <del>237.6</del>
2	CMA	Widen I-580 for EB and WB HOV and auxiliary lanes from Tassajara Road to Greenville Road	RM 2 Toll Bridge Program	272.2
3	CMA	Extend NB I-880 HOV lanes north from Hacienda	LATIP project	<b>167.5</b> <del>155.5</del>
4	CMA	Central Alameda County Integrated Corridor Mobility Program (includes adaptive ramp metering)	LATIP project. Includes a portion of Caltrans Corridor Management project Ramp Metering on I-580 from Benedict Drive to Castro Valley Blvd, TOS on I-580 from Dutton to I-680 and Ramp Metering at Eden Canyon interchange.	<b>33.5</b> <del>32.5</del>
5	CMA	Soundwalls	LATIP project	10.0

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	COST
<b>6</b>	<b>CMA</b>	<b>I-580 right-of-way preservation for transit in the I-580 corridor</b>		<b>123.5</b>
<del>7</del> 6	CMA/ ACTIA	Bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs	Funding includes \$100 m from 2000 Measure B sales tax program and \$100 m from other sources, such as TLC, Safe Routes to School, Safe Routes to Transit, Lifeline, Bay Trail or other grants, etc.	<b>305.0</b> <del>200.0</del>
<del>8</del> 7	ACTIA	I-580 on- and off-ramp improvements in Castro Valley	Replaces and constructs on and off -ramps from I-580 within Castro Valley. Constructs WB I-580 off-ramp to Redwood Road and EB I-580 on-ramp from Redwood Road, and replaces EB I-580 off-ramp to Center Street with an off-ramp to Grove Way.	34.9
<del>9</del> 8	ACTIA	Transit enhancements funded by transit center development funds		<b>4.8</b> <del>4.0</del>
<del>10</del> 9	ACTIA	Paratransit for AC Transit, BART, non-mandated city programs, service gap coordination		<b>154.6</b> <del>130.0</del>
<del>11</del> 10	ACTIA	I-580 auxiliary lanes between Santa Rita Road/Tassajara Road and Airway Boulevard interchanges	Auxiliary lanes between Santa Rita Road/Tassajara Road, El Charro Road/Fallon Road and Airway Boulevard interchanges in the WB direction.	<b>5.5</b> <del>5.1</del>
<del>12</del> 11	BART	New West Dublin/Pleasanton BART Station	Station will be situated on the active BART line between the East Dublin-Pleasanton and Castro Valley BART Stations in the median of I-580.	80.0
<del>13</del> 12	BART	BART-Oakland International Airport connector	Establishes 3.2 mile long Automated Guideway Transit system running on an exclusive right-of-way along Hegenberger Road corridor between Coliseum BART and planned Coliseum Amtrak Stations and the Oakland International Airport.	<b>459.0</b> <del>469.0</del>
<b>14</b>	<b>Caltrans/ CMA</b>	<b>I-580 Eastbound Truck Climbing Lane</b>	<b>Construct I-580 eastbound truck climbing lane at Altamont Summit (project moved from Tier 3 to Committed)</b>	<b>64.2</b>
<del>15</del> 13	Caltrans	I-880/SR-92 interchange improvements	Reconstruct existing cloverleaf interchange at I-880/SR-92 with direct connectors.	245.0



#	SPONSOR	PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	COST
<b>16</b> <del>14</del>	Caltrans	Reconstruct I-880/ SR-262 interchange and widen I-880 from SR-262 (Mission Boulevard) to the Santa Clara County line from 8 lanes to 10 lanes (8 mixed-flow and 2 HOV lanes)	In Santa Clara and Alameda Counties on I- 880 from SR-237 to Fremont Blvd and in Alameda County on SR-262 from I-880 to Warm Springs Blvd: reconstruct the SR-262 (Mission Boulevard)/Warren Avenue/ I-880 interchange and widen I-880; widen I-880 and SR-262; reconstruct SR-262/I- 880 interchange; reconstruct SR-262/Kato Road interchange; provide a local access interchange at Warren Avenue; reconstruct two UPRR underpasses.	186.8
<b>17</b> <del>15</del>	Caltrans	Widen I-880 for SB HOV lane from Hegenberger Road to Marina Boulevard (reconstruct bridges at Davis Street and Marina Boulevard)		<b>119.4</b> <del>108.0</del>
<b>18</b> <del>16</del>	Caltrans	I-880/Oak Street on-ramp reconstruction		26.7
<b>19</b> <del>17</del>	Caltrans	Extend HOV lane on I-880 NB from existing HOV terminus at Bay Bridge approach to Maritime on-ramp		<b>19.0</b> <del>16.9</del>
<b>20</b> <del>18</del>	Caltrans	Widen I-238 between I-580 and I-880 from 4 lanes to 6 lanes; auxiliary lanes on I-880 between I- 238 and "A" Street		<b>122.6</b> <del>109.2</del>
<b>21</b> <del>19</del>	Caltrans	SR-84 WB HOV on-ramp from Newark Boulevard		12.5
<b>22</b> <del>20</del>	Caltrans	SR-84 WB HOV lane extension from Newark Boulevard to I-880.		11.4
<b>23</b>	<b>Port</b>	<b>7<sup>th</sup> Street Grade Separation</b>	<b>Improve 7<sup>th</sup> Street/Union Pacific Railroad entry at Port of Oakland Intermodal yards to include grade separation</b>	<b>427.0</b>
<b>24</b>	<b>Port</b>	<b>Outer Harbor Intermodal Terminal (OHIT)</b>	<b>Relocate the OHIT to the former Oakland Army Base (including railyard, storage tracks, lead tracks, truck gates and administrative/operations and maintenance buildings</b>	<b>220.0</b>

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	COST
<b>25</b>	<b>Port</b>	<b>Martinez Subdivision</b>	<b>Improve Martinez Subdivision to include two additional mainline tracks, including crossovers and signaling</b>	<b>215.0</b>
<b>26</b> <del>21</del>	City of Alameda	Stargell (formerly Tinker) Avenue from Webster Street (SR-260) to 5th Avenue	Construct signalized intersections, in addition 4 lanes with turn pockets on Stargell and on Webster at the Stargell intersection, construct bus queue jump lane and transit center in front of the college.	18.6
<b>27</b> <del>22</del>	City of Berkeley	Ed Roberts Campus at Ashby BART Station	Develops the Ed Roberts Campus, a universally designed, transit-oriented office building and café at eastern portion of Ashby BART station to provide transit-accessible services for disabled and seniors. Includes parking garage and bike/pedestrian/transit access improvements.	<b>43.5</b> <del>43.0</del>
<b>28</b> <del>23</del>	City of Dublin	Iron Horse bicycle, pedestrian and transit route	Bicycle/pedestrian/roadway and transit lane in existing Alameda County and Southern Pacific right-of-way between the Dublin BART station to Dougherty Road and bus lanes along Dougherty Road.	10.9
<b>29</b> <del>24</del>	City of Fremont	SR-262/Warren Avenue/I-880 interchange improvements (including Union Pacific Railroad grade separation)	Serves as Phase 2 of SR-262/I-880 Freeway Interchange Reconstruction and I-880 Widening Project. Phases 1a and 1b includes direct connectors between SR-262 with HOV bypass lanes along the on-ramps and freeway widening to complete HOV lanes to the Santa Clara County line.	<b>56.0</b> <del>52.0</del>
<b>30</b> <del>25</del>	City of Fremont	Infrastructure for future Irvington BART Station	Constructs element of future station that will permit future station construction while BART is in service.	2.4
<b>31</b> <del>26</del>	City of Fremont	Kato Road from Warren Avenue to Milmont Drive	Widen Kato Road to provide 3-lane street with bike lanes from north of Auburn Street to where frontage improvements are on both sides of the street west of Milmont Drive.	<b>5.4</b> <del>3.0</del>
<b>32</b> <del>27</del>	City of Fremont	Fremont Boulevard to connect to I-880/Dixon Landing Road	Extend Fremont Boulevard (4-lane roadway with Class II bike lanes on both sides and construct portion of the Bay Trail (Class I bike facility)) on west side of the roadway) from its southerly terminus at Lakeview Blvd to Dixon Landing Road in Milpitas.	<b>8.9</b> <del>8.5</del>

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	COST
<del>33</del> 28	City of Fremont	Washington/Paseo Padre Parkway Grade Separation	Construct grade separations (underpass at Paseo Padre Parkway and overpass at Washington Boulevard) at the UPRR tracks and proposed BART extension.	108.6
<del>34</del> 29	City of Hayward	SR-238 Corridor Improvements between Foothill Boulevard/I-580 and Industrial	Adds travel lanes on Foothill Boulevard north of Mission-Foothill Jackson intersection by removing parking during peak hours, and south of Mission-Foothill-Jackson to Palisades Street. Spot widening at Mission Boulevard/Carlos Bee Boulevard and improvements at Mission/Harder, Mission/Berry, Mission/Moreau High School and Mission/Tennyson. Constructs a one-way loop system in downtown Hayward by converting Foothill Boulevard between Jackson and A Street to 6 lanes NB, A Street between Foothill Boulevard and A Street to 5 lanes WB and Mission Boulevard to 5 lanes SB between A Street and Jackson Street.	<del>116.0</del> 111.0
<del>35</del> 30	City of Hayward	I-880 auxiliary lane West A to Winton	LATIP project	<del>36.5</del> 32.5
<del>36</del> 31	City of Hayward	I-880 auxiliary lane from Whipple Road to Industrial Parkway	LATIP project	<del>21.9</del> 19.5
<del>37</del> 32	City of Hayward	I-880/SR-92 Reliever, Clawiter/Whitesell/SR-92 interchange	LATIP project	<del>58.3</del> 52.0
<del>38</del> 33	City of Hayward	I-880/Industrial Parkway West interchange, Phase 2	LATIP project	<del>29.2</del> 26.3
<del>39</del> 34	City of Hayward	Construct street extension in Hayward near Clawiter and Whitesell Streets		<del>26.9</del> 25.5
<del>40</del> 35	City of Livermore	Las Positas Road Connection, Phase 2	Complete the 4-lane roadway section from Arroyo Vista to 1,500 feet west of Vasco Road including a second parallel bridge over the Arroyo Seco.	<del>7.3</del> 6.4
<del>41</del> 36	City of Livermore	West Jack London Boulevard Extension	Construct 2-lane extension of West Jack London Blvd. from 5,000 feet west of Isabel/SR-84 to El Charro Road.	<del>18.7</del> 18.1

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	COST
42 37	City of Livermore	4-lane major arterial connecting Dublin Boulevard and North Canyons Parkway	Construct 4-lane arterial connection between the future easterly end of Dublin Boulevard in Dublin and the westerly end of North Canyons Parkway in Livermore. Along with planned improvements within Dublin, this would complete the freeway reliever route along the north side of I-580 between I-680 and SR-84 (Isabel Avenue).	<b>11.1</b> <del>10.0</del>
43 38	City of Livermore	I-580/Isabel interchange improvements, Phase 1	Construct new "Parclo" interchange at the extension of Isabel Avenue to I-580. Construct a 4-lane Isabel Avenue over I-580 and 2-lane extension north. Partial interchange at I-580/Portola Ave. Will be replaced with a 2-lane flyover and extension of Portola to the Isabel Avenue extension.	<b>155.9</b> <del>153.0</del>
44	City of Newark	<b>Dumbarton Rail Corridor Project</b>	<b>Implement commuter rail service on the Dumbarton Bridge (environmental, design, and right of way phases). RTP notes that shortfall remains for construction. Moved from Tier 2 to Committed.</b>	<b>301.0</b>
45 39	City of Piedmont	Traffic signal on Grand Avenue at Rose Avenue/Arroyo Avenue intersection in Piedmont		0.3
46 40	City of Pleasanton	I-580/San Ramon Road/Foothill Road interchange improvements		<b>2.1</b> <del>2.0</del>
47 41	City of Pleasanton	I-680/Bernal Avenue interchange improvements	Remove SB loop off ramp and install SB loop on ramp, new SB diagonal off-ramp and widening of the diagonal NB on ramp, with street widening of Bernal for 3 lanes in each direction under the existing structure.	<b>17.0</b> <del>16.0</del>
48 42	City of San Leandro	Washington Avenue/Beatrice Street interchange improvements	Local improvements to Beatrice Street and Washington Avenue interchange in San Leandro by constructing on and off ramp widening improvements at the Beatrice Street/I-880 freeway ramp and intersection widening at Washington and Fargo Avenues.	2.5
49 43	City of San Leandro	I-880/Marina Boulevard interchange	LATIP project	<b>36.1</b> <del>33.0</del>

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	COST
<b>50</b> 44	City of San Leandro	I-880/Davis Street interchange	LATIP project	<b>24.4</b> 22.0
<b>51</b> 45	City of Union City	Union City Intermodal Station (Phase 1)	Essential first step in making Union City BART Station a two-sided station accessible to a 30-acre TOD site (former PG&E site). Constructs pedestrian grade separations under BART and UPRR tracks and reconfigures the existing BART Station to provide a new multi-modal Loop Road, a Bus Transit Facility providing 16-bus bay capacity with transit amenities, a Decoto Connector Road and reconfigures BART surface parking lots and replacement BART parking on the Agency owned TOD site.	40.0
<b>52</b>	<b>LAVTA</b>	<b>Livermore/Dublin Bus Rapid Transit Project</b>	<b>Implement enhanced rapid bus service in Livermore, Dublin, and Pleasanton (includes higher frequencies, new stops, and improved stop amenities). Project moved from Tier 2 to Committed.</b>	<b>14.1</b>
<b>53</b>	<b>LAVTA</b>	<b>Satellite Operations and Maintenance Facility</b>	<b>Construct initial phase of a new satellite operations and maintenance facility for operations, dispatch, maintenance, fueling, bus wash and parking facilities for LAVTA fixed route service</b>	<b>7.8</b>
<b>54</b> 46	WETA	Berkeley/Albany to San Francisco ferry service		56.6
<b>55</b> 47	WETA	Alameda/Oakland to San Francisco ferry service and Harbor Bay to San Francisco ferry service	Ferry service from Alameda/Oakland to San Francisco and Harbor Bay to San Francisco. <b>(Project is in Tier 2 as well with \$9.5 M in discretionary funds)</b>	<b>21.5</b> 20.0
			<b>Total</b>	<b>4,810.5</b> <b>3,795.1</b>

Source: Metropolitan Transportation Commission, **Resolution No. 3893 Final Transportation 2035 Plan adopted April 22, 2009.** ~~as of June 4, 2008.~~

## Tier 1 and Tier 2 Investments

Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects and programs represent the next level of investment in the county's transportation system. Tier 1 and Tier 2 are based on what the CMA reasonably expects to receive from STIP funding over the next 25 years, or about \$1.12 billion. Tier 1 and Tier 2 do not include federal funds that are "set aside" for maintenance of local streets and roads, transit rehabilitation, the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program, the Transportation for Livable Communities program or MTC's regional programs such as the regional rideshare program.

## Tier 1 Projects and Programs

The CMA's policy on high priority projects states that "*Resources will be focused on these projects over the next several State and Federal funding cycles to ensure delivery of these improvements.*" As shown in Table 6.2, Tier 1 consists of five **high priority projects** which meet the following criteria:

- Has a reasonable expectation of being included in the financially constrained Regional Transportation Plan and Countywide Transportation Plan;
- Provides congestion relief beyond a single planning area; and
- Improves mobility and/or connectivity beyond a single planning area.
- 2004 high priority projects not fully funded

**Table 6.2—High Priority Projects (\$ millions)**

SPONSOR	PROJECT/PROGRAM	COST	25-YEAR STIP
AC Transit	East Bay Bus Rapid Transit, Telegraph/International/E. 14 <sup>th</sup> (Berkeley Oakland San Leandro)	\$250	<del>\$74</del> <del>65</del>
BART	Warm Springs BART	\$747 (2007 \$)	<del>\$144</del> <del>100</del>
CMA	I-580 Corridor Improvements:		
	• HOT Lanes	\$36	
	• WB auxiliary lane at Isabel	\$10	<del>\$39</del>
	<del>• Right of way preservation for transit</del> (project moved to Table 6.1 Committed)	<del>\$125</del>	<del>50</del>
Countywide	TOD Improvement Program, including access and infrastructure improvements to support TOD.	TBD	\$30
Countywide	Arterial Performance Initiative Program	TBD	\$15
<b>Total</b>			<del>\$302</del> <del>260</del>

## Tier 2 Projects and Programs

Tier 2 is comprised of projects and programs recommended by the planning areas, certain countywide programs and additional funding from the STIP for transit capital replacement. Table 6.3 presents Tiers 1 and 2 proposed investments by category and Table 6.4 depicts Tier 2 proposed investments by planning areas.

**Table 6.3—Tier 1 and Tier 2 Proposed 25-Year STIP by Category (\$ millions)**

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
<b>Maintenance and Safety</b>					
1	AC Transit/ BART	Transit Capital Replacement	TBD	233	Represents the estimated Public Transit Account funds that will be available over the 25-year planning horizon for transit capital replacement.
2	City of Alameda/ Alameda County	Bridge Seismic and Safety Improvements	14.6 <del>15.6</del>	7.0	Includes 3 projects: Estuary Bridges, Fruitvale Railroad Bridge and Fruitvale Avenue Roadway Bridge. Includes \$8.1 from Highway Bridge Program and \$0.5 from Prop 1B.
3	City of Berkeley	Railroad Crossing Improvements	2.0	2.0	Proposed \$2 will enable planning/design, not capital. \$2 includes Gilman Grade Separation.
4	Alameda County	Safety Improvements in unincorporated Alameda County	27.7	21.0	Includes \$11 for Crow Canyon Safety Imps. and \$10 for Vasco Road Phase 2 Safety Improvements. Local funds include \$0.5 CMA and \$6.2 Prop 1B local.
5	City of Newark	Central Avenue Railroad Overpass	18.3	12.6	Balance from \$0.6 federal earmark, CMA local funds \$0.6, local gas tax \$0.4 and \$4.1 City general fund reserves.
<b>Goods Movement</b>					
6	Caltrans	Truck Parking	5.0	5.0	Project development for recommendations in Truck Parking Study.
7	Port of Oakland	North Airport Air Cargo Access Road Improvements, Phase 1	10.0	5.0	Local funds are from \$5.0 from Port.

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
<b>Freeway Performance/Pricing</b>					
8	North County	I-80 Local interchange improvements	10.8	9.0	I-80/Gilman, I-80/Powell and I-80 Aquatic Park access. Local funds are \$1.5 City of Berkeley; \$0.4 from City of Emeryville.
9	North County	North I-880 Local Interchange Improvements	55.9	41.2	Broadway/Jackson, 66th/Hegenberger and 42nd and High Street. Local funds including ACTIA and previous STIP totaling \$8.6 from City of Alameda and \$5.9 STIP from Oakland.
10	Central County	Central I-880 Local Interchange Improvements	41.7	41.7	Includes I-880/West A street and I-880 Industrial Parkway.
11	South County	South I-680/SR-262/Warm Springs Blvd. Local interchange improvements	10.0	10.0	Phase 1 is urban interchange at SR-262. Warm Springs Blvd. and improvements at SR-262/I-680.
12	East County	I-580 Local interchange improvements in Dublin	37.6	16.0	Interchange improvements at Hacienda and Fallon. Local funding includes \$21.6 from fees from Pleasanton, Livermore and EDTIF.
13	East County	I-580 Local interchange improvements in Livermore	<b>163.0</b> <del>133.0</del>	16.0	Reconstruction and modifications to I-580/First Street, I-580/Isabel Phase 2, I-580/Greenville Road and I-580/Vasco Road, including auxiliary lanes. Local funds \$117.



#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
14	East County	Project Development for I-580/I-680 Connector	15.0	15.0	From the Triangle Study list. This was considered off the top.
15	East County	<b>High Priority Project</b> I-580 Corridor Improvements	<b>45.0</b> <del>175.0</del>	<b>39.0</b> <del>50.0</del>	Includes auxiliary lanes at Isabel for \$10, I-580 EB and WB HOT Lanes for \$36 and \$15 for right-of-way preservation for transit. Existing funds include for HOT Lanes; \$3 from TCRP, \$16 from RMI and \$95 from AB 1107 for right-of-way preservation. <b>Right of way preservation moved to Table 6.1 Committed.</b>
<b>Arterial Performance/Pricing</b>					
16	Countywide	<b>High Priority Project</b> Arterial Performance Initiative	39.0	39.0	Companion to MTC's freeway performance initiative. \$15 for Countywide Arterial Performance Program. Other projects include signal interconnect, transit priority, incident management, traveler information and intersection improvements. Includes \$22 in Oakland and \$2 in San Leandro.
17	City of Berkeley	Berkeley Parking Pricing Program	5.0	3.0	Capital component. Citywide Pay/Display Parking Pricing Program, Dynamic Parking Signage. \$2 local funds from parking meter revenue.
18	City of San Leandro	E. 14th at Hesperian/ 150th Avenue	3.4	2.0	Local funds include \$1 from Measure B and \$0.4 from redevelopment funds.
19	City of Fremont	AutoMall Parkway Intersection Improvements	42.0	9.0	

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
20	City of Union City	ACTA East West Connector (formerly SR-84) between Mission Boulevard in Union City and I-880 in Fremont	<b>160.2</b> <del>150.0</del>	9.6	Local funds include \$10 previous RTP, \$88 ACTA, \$10 ACTIA and \$32.4 local.
21	ACTIA	SR-84 Expressway Widening, Jack London to Vallecitos	<b>129.6</b> <del>124.0</del>	15.0	Local funds include \$12 from 2008 STIP, \$87 from ACTIA and \$10 from Tri Valley Transportation Committee fees.
22	City of Pleasanton	PSR and Project Development for SR-84 Widening, Pigeon Pass to I-680	<b>2.3</b> <del>2.0</del>	<b>2.3</b> <del>2.0</del>	Provides supplemental PSR and project development for widening.
<b>Transit Efficiency and Expansion</b>					
23	AC Transit	<b>High Priority Project</b> Telegraph/International/ E. 14th Street Bus Rapid Transit	250.0	<b>74.0</b> <del>85.0</del>	Includes <del>\$54</del> <b>65</b> as a high priority project; <del>\$16</del> <b>18</b> from PA 1 and <del>\$4</del> <b>2</b> from PA 2. Together with federal and other state and local funds will fully fund project.
24	AC Transit	Maintenance Facilities Improvements	16.1	16.1	Includes environmental sustainability, expand facilities, zero emission imps, heavy equipment and IT infrastructure. PA 1 share is \$10, PA 2 is \$5.5 and PA 3 is \$0.6. Additional projects are included in Vision.
25	AC Transit	Transit Priority Measures/ Speed Protection (includes Bay Bridge Related Improvements)	120.0	14.8	PA 1 share is \$10.5, PA 2 is \$3.3 and PA 3 is \$1.6. Spot level infrastructure improvements to improve bus operations. Construction is eligible for Tier 3 HOT Lane revenues. Balance is in Vision.

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
26	AC Transit	Grand/MacArthur Bus Rapid Transit	41.0 <del>35.0</del>	30.0 <del>6.0</del>	Will provide project development for BRT. Seeking Very Small Starts federal funds. Balance is in Vision.
27	AC Transit	Additional buses for Frequent Service Network	22.0 <del>16.0</del>	22.0 <del>4.0</del>	
28	AC Transit	Transfer Center/Park & Ride Facility at or near Chabot College	2.0	2.0	
29	BART	Station Capacity Projects	32.5	32.5	Projects which enable BART stations to accommodate more riders. Examples include new elevators, escalators, stairs or fare equipment. PA 1 share is \$26, PA 2 is \$4.5 and PA 3 is \$3. Balance funding proposed for Vision.
30	BART	Station Access Projects	26.5	26.5	Projects which facilitate access to BART stations. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements, Intermodal Facilities, Signage. PA 1 share is \$9.5, PA 2 is \$14.0, PA 3 is \$2 and PA 4 is \$2. Balance funding proposed for Vision.
31	BART	High Priority Project Warm Springs Extension	890.0 <del>747.0</del>	144.0 <del>160.0</del>	Included in Resolution 3434. Assumes funding from State and Local Partnership Funds - \$86. Other funds include \$100 TCRP, \$40m Prop 1B Transit, \$85 RM2, \$53 84 RM1, <del>\$145 San Mateo</del> , <del>\$221 222 ACTIA</del> , <del>\$205 Resolution 1876</del> , <del>\$5 AB 1171</del> , and <del>\$26 Other.</del> and <del>\$2 CMA TRP.</del>

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
32	City of Newark	Dumbarton Rail	301.0 539.6	301.0 14.8	Included in combined application from San Mateo/Santa Clara and Alameda. This represents CMA share. <b>Included in Resolution 3434. Project moved to Table 6.1 Committed.</b>
33	LAVTA	Route 10 Bus Rapid Transit Project	21.6	5.0	Other funds include \$2.9 New Starts, \$6.4 5307 Program, \$0.6 Prop 1B, \$1.0 TDA and \$0.3 ACTIA. <b>Included in Resolution 3434. Project moved to Table 6.1 Committed.</b>
<b>Transit-Oriented Development/Priority Development Areas</b>					
32	Countywide	<b>High Priority Project</b>	<b>180.6</b>	<b>96.6</b>	Allocated \$30 countywide and includes West End Transit Hub in Alameda, Berkeley Infrastructure, Coliseum, MacArthur and West Oakland BART transit villages in Oakland; Castro Valley BART TOD, South Hayward BART TOD, Downtown San Leandro TOD and Bay Fair BART TOD.
34		Access and infrastructure improvements to support TOD	111.6	111.6	
33	Countywide	Bicycle and Pedestrian Program	40.1	27.3	Includes projects in Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Piedmont, San Leandro, Alameda County in PA 4 and Dublin.
35			46.6	33.8	
34	City of	Union City Intermodal	21.0	14.0	\$7 from Redevelopment funds.
36	Union City				
<b>Community Based Transportation Plan Implementation</b>					

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
35 37	Alameda County	Projects Identified in CBTP	29.3	24.90	Pedestrian and streetscape improvements in Cherryland/Ashland and E. Lewelling Blvd. Balance of funds from Measure B, Lifeline Transportation, Prop 1B, CMAQ quality and other for E. Lewelling. Federal earmark of \$2.6 approved for Ashland/Cherryland.
<b>Other</b>					
36 38	City of Oakland	SR-24 Corridor/Caldecott Tunnel Enhancements	8.0	6.0	
37 39	Countywide	Sound Wall Program	10.00	10.0	\$4 for City of Oakland and \$6 for countywide
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$1094.1*</b> <b><del>1,130.6</del></b>	

\* Includes Transit Capital Replacement for \$233.0.

**Table 6.4—Tier 1 and Tier 2 Investments Proposed 25-Year STIP by Planning Area (\$ millions)**

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
<b>Multi-Area Projects</b>					
1	AC Transit	<b>High Priority Project</b> Telegraph/International/E. 14th Street BRT	250.0	<b>74.0</b> 85.0	PA1-\$16, PA2-\$4.0 and High Priority Funding- \$54.65. <b>Total funds \$250.0: Balance-FTA New</b> Starts-\$75; Other Federal-\$ 2; <del>Prop 1B</del> -\$1.1; RM2-\$65; Sales Tax from counties-\$24.0 21.9; <b>RTIP - \$50; Other (CMAQ Bonus Funds) -</b> <b>\$35.</b>
2	AC Transit	Maintenance Facilities Improvements	16.1	16.1	PA Breakdown: PA 1-\$10.0; PA 2- \$5.5; PA 3- \$0.6 Spot level infrastructure improvements to improve Bus operations--Construction is eligible for Tier 3 HOT Lane revenues.
3	AC Transit	Transit Priority Measures/Speed Protection (includes Bay Bridge Related Improvements)	14.8	14.8	PA Breakdown: PA 1-\$10.5; PA 2- \$3.7; PA 3- \$0.6. Spot level infrastructure improvements to improve Bus operations--Construction is eligible for Tier 3 HOT Lane revenues.
4	AC Transit	Additional buses for Frequent Service Transit Network	<b>22.0</b> 16.0	<b>22.0</b> 4.0	PA Breakdown: PA 2-\$2.2; PA 3-\$1.8. Balance funding-\$12 from Contra Costa County <b>and other</b> <b>sources.</b>
5	BART	Station Capacity Projects	32.5	32.5	Total program cost is \$652.3. Balance funding proposed for Vision. Projects which enable BART stations to accommodate more riders. Examples include new elevators, escalators, stairs or fare equipment.

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
6	BART	Station Access Projects	26.5	26.5	Total program cost is \$840. Balance funding proposed for Vision. Projects which facilitate access to BART stations. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements, Intermodal Facilities, Signage.
7	CMA	Sound Wall Program	10.0	10.0	\$4.0 from PA1 share and \$6.0 countywide.
8	Countywide	<b>High Priority Project</b> TOD Improvement Program	30.0	30.0	
9	Countywide	<b>High Priority Project</b> Arterial Performance Initiative Program	15.0	15.0	\$15 is from High Priority set aside.
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>426.9</b>	<b>240.9</b>	
			<b>410.9</b>	<b>233.9</b>	
<b>Planning Area 1</b>					
10	AC Transit	Grand/MacArthur BRT	41.0	30.0	Balance: Seeking Very Small Starts federal funds.
			35.0	6.0	
11	City of Alameda/ Alameda County	Estuary Bridges Seismic Retrofit and Repair	4.0	1.0	Balance funding: \$2.5 Highway Bridge Program, \$0.5 Prop. 1B.
12	City of Alameda/ Alameda County	Fruitvale Avenue Roadway Bridge Seismic Retrofit	8.0	5.0	Balance funding: \$3 Highway Bridge Program.
13	City of Alameda/ Alameda County	Fruitvale Avenue Rail Bridge Seismic Retrofit	2.6	1.0	Balance funding: \$1.6 Highway Bridge Program.

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
14	City of Alameda/Caltrans	I-880 Broadway/Jackson Phase I	26.0	17.2	Balance funding: \$5.8 Measure B; \$3.0 STIP.
15	City of Alameda	West End Transit Hub	1.4	1.4	Transit Improvements for City of Alameda. Taken off the top of PA1 Transit share
16	City of Albany	Bike and Pedestrian Improvements	2.3	2.3	
17	City of Berkeley	Gilman I-80 interchange improvements	7.0	5.5	Balance funding: \$1.2 Federal Earmark, \$0.3 Local match
18	City of Berkeley	TOD Infrastructure	5.2	5.0	Balance funding: Workforce Housing \$0.1, TLC Planning Grant \$0.1 (completed)
19	City of Berkeley	Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements	6.0	6.0	
20	City of Berkeley	Bicycle Plan Implementation	11.0	3.0	Balance funding: Measure B \$3.1, TDA \$ .8, General Fund \$4.1.
21	City of Berkeley	Ashby I-80 interchange/Aquatic Park Access Improvements	2.0	2.0	
22	City of Berkeley	Berkeley Parking Pricing Program	5.0	3.0	Balance funding: \$2 general fund
23	City of Berkeley	Railroad Crossing Improvements, Phase 1	2.0	2.0	Phase 1 will enable planning/design, not capital.
24	Caltrans	Truck Parking facilities in North County	5.0	5.0	



#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
25	Caltrans	I-880 North Improvements:-I-880 SB and 66th/Hegenberger auxiliary Lanes	5.0	5.0	
26	City of Emeryville	65 <sup>th</sup> Street Bike / Pedestrian Bridge at I-80, Phase 1	3.7	3.5	Balance funding: \$0.2 Local for PSR (allocated ).
27	City of Emeryville	I-80 Eastbound off-ramp at Powell Street	1.8	1.5	Balance funding: \$0.3 Local TIF
28	City of Oakland	I-880 improvement program including 42nd and High Access Improvements.	24.9	19.0	Balance funding: \$5.9 STIP (previously programmed)
29	City of Oakland	Citywide ITS	22.0	22.0	CMA Arterial Performance Set Aside or PA 1 Share.

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
		<p>SMART Growth/TOD: Transit Villages at BART Stations including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coliseum (replacement parking and station area improvements)</li> <li>MacArthur (replacement parking and station area improvements)</li> <li>West Oakland (replacement parking, station area improvements and bike/pedestrian access)</li> </ul>	57.0	57.0	
30	City of Oakland				
31	City of Oakland	SR-24 /Caldecott Tunnel Enhancements	8.0	6.0	Balance funding: RTP County shares from 2008 STIP (to be adopted by CTC May 29, 2008). These funds to be swapped for CCCTA Measure J sales tax funds and advanced to City of Oakland for project development.
32	City of Piedmont	Addition of Bike Lanes and Congestion Relief in Highland and Magnolia Ave. areas	1.2	1.2	Proposed for Tier 4 list. Adding bicycle lanes and implementing congestion relief practices as part of the City of Piedmont's current civic master plan.
33	City of Piedmont	Comprehensive City Street Upgrades	0.5	0.5	Repairs and upgrades for improving vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle mobility.
34	Port of Oakland	North Airport Air Cargo Access Road Improvements, Phase 1	10.0	5.0	Balance funding: \$5 Local Port funds.

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
<b>PA 1 Total</b>			<b>262.6</b>	<b>210.1</b>	
			<b>256.5</b>	<b>186.1</b>	
<b>Planning Area 2</b>					
35	AC Transit	Transfer Center at or near Chabot College	2.0	2.0	
36	Alameda County	Crow Canyon Road Safety Improvements	14.5	11.0	Balance funding: Prop 1-B \$3.0, Local CMA TIP: \$0.5
37	Alameda County	East Lewelling Boulevard Roadway Improvements	11.7	9.9	Balance funding: \$1.8 local road funds
38	Alameda County	Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvements in Cherryland/Ashland	17.6	15.0	Balance funding: Federal Earmarks \$2.6
39	Alameda County	Castro Valley BART TOD	44.0	5.2	Balance funding will come from Developers, public and private sources.
40	City of Hayward	I-880/West A Street interchange	27.0	27.0	
41	City of Hayward	South Hayward BART Transit Village	50.0	5.0	Balance funding: No existing funding programmed although much of the remaining funding need will come from developers and other public and private sources.
42	City of Hayward	I-880/Industrial Parkway interchange, Phase 1	14.7	14.7	
43	City of San Leandro	Downtown San Leandro TOD	4.0	4.0	Construct San Leandro Blvd Streetscape

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
44	City of San Leandro	City of San Leandro Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvements	13.3	13.3	
45	City of San Leandro	E.14th St at the Hesperian Blvd/150th Avenue.	3.4	2.0	Balance funding: Measure B \$1, Local Redevelopment funds \$0.4
46	City of San Leandro	Traffic Signal System Upgrade	2.0	2.0	
47	City of San Leandro	Bay Fair BART Transit Village	4.0	4.0	
<b>PA 2 Total</b>			<b>208.2</b>	<b>115.1</b>	
<b>Planning Area 3</b>					
48	BART	<b>High Priority Project</b> Warm Springs Extension	<b>890.0</b> 747.0	<b>144.0</b> 160.0	High priority funding \$84 100. Fremont STIP share \$60. <b>Total funds shown \$890.0:</b> Balance <del>funding: total existing funds shown \$656.</del> TCRP - \$100; Prop 1B Transit \$40; <b>RTIP</b> \$69; RM2-85; RM1-\$53 84; SFO Extra Surplus Revenue \$54; 1/2cent sales tax for transit funding and 1/2 cent local options sales tax -\$221 222; <b>Resolution</b> <b>1876 - \$205; Other - \$26; Prop 1B SLPP - \$86;</b> <b>AB 1171 - \$5. CMA-TPP-\$2.</b>
49	City of Fremont	SR-262 Mission Blvd Improvements	10.0	10.0	
50	City of Fremont	Automall Parkway Intersection Improvements between I-880 and I-680	42.0	9.0	Balance Funding: TIF/Developer contribution, \$33.

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
51	City of Newark	Central Avenue Railroad Overpass	18.3	12.6	Balance: CMA TIP \$0.6, SAFETEA Earmark \$ 0.60 , Local \$4.1, Gas Tax Subvention \$0.4.
52	City of Newark	Dumbarton Rail Corridor	<del>301.0</del> 539.6	14.8	Balance: ACTIA- Measure B- \$18.5; SMCTA- \$50m; SCVTA \$44; RM2- \$135- \$243.3 requested from Vision funds- (Note- Project moved to Committed list, Table 6.1)
52 53	City of Union City	Union City Intermodal, Phase 2	21.0	14.0	Balance funding: Redevelopment \$7.
53 54	City of Union City	ACTA East West Connector (formerly SR84) between Mission Boulevard in Union City and I-880 in Fremont	<del>160.2</del> 150.0	9.6	Balance funding: RTP \$10, ACTA Measure B \$88m, ACTIA Measure B \$ 10, Other Local \$42.6 32.4.
<b>PA 3 Total</b>			<b>1141.5</b>	<b>199.2</b>	
<b>PA 3 Total</b>			<b>1,527.9</b>	<b>230.0</b>	
<b>Planning Area 4</b>					
<b>High Priority Project</b>					
54 55	CMA	I-580 Corridor Improvements • I-580 HOT Lanes from Greenville Road west to I-680	35.0	29.0	Balance funding-CMAQ \$6.
55 56	CMA	• I-580 WB Auxiliary Lane from 1st St to Isabel	10.0	10.0	

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
57	CMA	<del>I-580 right-of-way</del> preservation for transit in the corridor	<del>123.5</del> 130.0	11.0	Balance funding: RM 1-\$16; AB1107 1/2-cent sales tax from 3-BART counties-\$95; Other local funds-\$5; ICRP-\$3.  <b>Project moved to Table 6.1 Committed</b>
56 58	ACTIA	SR-84 Expressway widening, Jack London to Vallecitos	<b>129.6</b> 124.0	15.0	Balance funding: ACTIA Measure B-\$87; TVTC- \$10; 2008 STIP-\$12; <b>Other local - \$5.6.</b>
57 59	Alameda County	Vasco Road Safety Improvements Phase II	13.2	10.0	Balance funding: Prop.1B LSR subvention-\$3.2.
58 60	Alameda County	Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements on Stanley Blvd	6.0	2.0	Balance funding: Prop.1B \$3.0, Local Road funds-\$1.0.
59 61	City of Dublin	Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements on Alamo Canal Trail	2.6	2.0	Balance funding: Dublin local funds-\$0.3; Pleasanton and Dublin funds-\$0.1; ACTIA-\$0.2.
60 62	City of Dublin	Dublin interchange improvements, (Hacienda & Fallon Road) Ph II	37.6	16.0	Balance funding: Private Development EDTIF \$10.8; Livermore \$5.4, Pleasanton \$5.4.
61 63	Cities of Dublin, Livermore and Pleasanton	Project Development for I-580/680 Connector	15.0	15.0	From the Triangle Study list-this project was considered off the top.
62 64	City of Livermore	I-580/First St. interchange Improve to ultimate configuration	37.0	4.0	Balance funding: Livermore Development fees- \$33

#	SPONSOR	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE	FUNDING REQUEST	FUNDING PLAN FOR REMAINING AMOUNT AND COMMENTS
63 65	City of Livermore	I-580/Vasco interchange Improve to ultimate configuration	55.0	4.0	Balance funding: SAFETEA-LU-\$2; Developer fees-\$49.
64 66	City of Livermore	Isabel Avenue/I-580 interchange Phase II	28.0	4.0	Balance funding: Livermore Development fees-\$24.
65 67	City of Livermore	I-580/Greenville Road interchange improvements	43.0	4.0	Balance: Livermore Development Fees: \$39.
66 68	City of Pleasanton	PSR Development for SR-84 Widening-Pigeon Pass to I-680	2.3 2.0	2.3 2.0	The PSR development will begin after the MOU is signed for Stoneridge Extension
69	LAVTA	Livermore/Dublin Bus Rapid Transit Project	21.6	5.0	Balance funding: FTA New Starts-\$2.9; FTA 5307-\$6.4; Prop.1B-\$0.6m; TDA-\$1; Measure B, \$0.3. Application includes \$5.4 in Vision: (Project moved to Committed list, Table 6.1)
PA 4 Total			416.6 560.0	117.3 133.0	
GRAND TOTAL			2456.0 2,963.5	882.6 898.1	

## Tier 3 Investments

Tier 3 includes candidates in three categories:

- State Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
- State Bond Candidate Projects
- Projects and Programs for HOT Lane Revenues

The CTC, upon recommendation by Caltrans, has responsibility for approving the ITIP and State bond projects and programs. Table 6.5 identifies the projects proposed for the ITIP and Table 6.6 shows the candidates **and commitments** for the State Bond Program for CTC's consideration.

**Table 6.5—Tier 3 ITIP Candidates** (\$ millions)

SPONSOR	PROJECT	COST	REQUEST	COMMENT
Interregional Roads				
CMA	I-80/I-880 Integrated Corridor Mobility	37.0	37.0	Connects I-880 and I-80 ICM projects. Addresses most congested corridors, supports MTC’s goal of managing the system and reducing congestion.
CMA	I-580/I-680 Connector, Phase 1, NB	572.0	572.0	Cost is escalated to the mid-point of construction (2016). I-580 is a major trade corridor and second most congested corridor in Alameda County and Bay Area. Ranked 2 in Triangle Study.
	I-680 to WB I-580	614.0	614.0	
Interregional Rail				
Capitol Corridor	Capitol Corridor	158.0	45.0 *	Double track from Oakland Coliseum to Industrial Boulevard. Construct station and track improvements, Alameda County share of program.
ACE	ACE	180.5	20.0 **	Track improvements and right-of-way preservation. Remainder to come from other ACE partners.

\* Per statute: ITIP funds will be budgeted as 91 percent interregional roads and nine percent interregional rail.

\*\* Represents Alameda County estimated share of ITIP for Intercity Rail.



**Table 6.6—Tier 3 State Bond Candidates (\$ millions)**

SPONSOR	PROJECT	COST	REQUEST	COMMENT
<b>Proposition 1B Trade Corridors</b>				
<i>Highway</i>				
Caltrans/ CMA	EB I-580 Truck Climbing Lane	<b>64.2</b> 83.5	<b>64.2</b> 65.0	<b>Project moved to Table 6.1 Committed.</b> <del>Match from SHOPP. High freight volume;</del> <del>consistent with State's Goods Movement</del> <del>Action Plan. Project submitted to CTC for</del> <del>TCIF.</del>
CMA	I-880: 23rd/ 29 <sup>th</sup> Street overcrossing	<b>163.4</b> 95.0	<b>66.5</b> 73.0	Match is \$8 RM2 Funds, \$2 Federal Funds and \$12 STIP Funds. High freight volume, consistent with State's Goods Movement Action Plan. Match from federal earmark, RM 2 and STIP. Project submitted to CTC for TCIF.
<i>Port</i>				
Port	7 <sup>th</sup> Street Grade Separation	427.0	<b>427.0</b> 175.0	<b>Project moved to Table 6.1 Committed.</b> <del>Match is \$252 consisting of Port. Project</del> <del>submitted to CTC for TCIF shows</del> <del>combination of Trade Corridors and SHOPP.</del>
Port	Martinez Subdivision	215.0	<b>215.0</b> 107.0	<b>Project moved to Table 6.1 Committed.</b> <del>\$215 is first phase work; match from</del> <del>railroad. Project submitted to CTC for TCIF.</del>
Port	Outer Harbor Intermodal Terminal	<b>220.0</b> 325.0	<b>220.0</b> 162.5	<b>Project moved to Table 6.1 Committed.</b> <del>Match from Port and railroad. Project</del> <del>submitted to CTC for TCIF.</del>
State	Donner Summit Improvements	90.0	45.0	Match from UPRR. Project submitted to CTC for TCIF.
State	Tehachapi Trade Corridor Rail Improvements	82.0	41.0	Match from BNSF railroad. Project submitted to CTC for TCIF.
<b>State Local Partnership Funds</b>			40-60	Encourage ACTIA to close funding gap for BART Warm Springs to the extent possible. Extension is a CMA High Priority Project that has not been fully funded.
<b>Transit Safety and Security</b>				
AC Transit	AC Transit	35.0	35.0	

SPONSOR	PROJECT	COST	REQUEST	COMMENT
BART	BART	88.0	88.0	Emergency communications, locals and alarms, public safety awareness, real time surveillance, structural augmentation and weapons detection system.
<b>Traffic Light Synchronization Program</b>				
CMA	I-80 ICM, arterial component	24.3	24.3	Companion to I-80 ICM.

As part of the regional transportation plan update, MTC determined that revenues generated by the implementation of HOT Lanes. Candidate projects and programs for HOT Lane revenues are approved by the CMA Board for I-580 and the Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) for I-680 per existing statute. The CMA Board will identify projects and programs for I-80 and I-880 if HOT Lanes are implemented on these facilities. The projects and programs proposed for HOT Lane revenues generated in Alameda County are shown in Table 6.7.

The CMA adopted the following policy on how HOT Lane revenues will be spent:

- First priority is to sustain adequate funding for Operation and Maintenance of the HOT Lanes;
- Of the remaining net revenues, 50 percent would be available for transit vehicles and operations serving the corridor and 50 percent would be available for capital investments in the corridor (with HOT Lane extensions in the corridor given priority).

**Table 6.7—Tier 3 Projects and Programs for HOT Lane Revenues**

PROJECT	SPONSOR
<b>I-680 Corridor</b>	
Express bus service, including vehicles	Sunol Smart Carpool Lane JPA/Caltrans
NB HOV/HOT Lane	Sunol Smart Carpool Lane JPA/Caltrans
HOT Lane Extensions	CMA/Caltrans
<b>I-580 Corridor</b>	
Express bus service, including vehicles	LAVTA/San Joaquin SMART
BRT parallel to I-580	LAVTA
Rail extension improvements	BART/ACE
HOT Lane extensions	CMA
<b>I-880 Corridor</b>	
Express bus service, including vehicles	AC Transit
NB I-880 HOV extension from Hacienda to Hegenberger	CMA
I-238 HOT Lane	
SB I-880 to WB SR-84 HOV Connector	Caltrans
HOT Lane extensions	CMA
<b>I-80 Corridor</b>	
▪ Express bus service, including vehicles	AC Transit
▪ HOV/HOT ramp connectors	CMA/Caltrans
▪ ITS Management Technologies	

## Tier 4 Investments

As a part of the update to the regional transportation plan, MTC ~~will~~ included projects for which no revenues ~~were have been~~ identified, but may be advanced as new funds are available. These projects will be used to advocate for new revenue sources. In approving the following types of projects, the CMA Board adopted the following principle:

*The proposed candidates for the Vision are based on MTC's stated overarching goals for the regional transportation plan: Economy, Environment and Equity. The mainstays of MTC's approach to the RTP are pricing and intensification of land use. In order for these to be successful, improvements must be in place to provide alternatives to driving alone. Vision projects and programs serve as examples of the types of projects that have been forwarded to MTC as our vision for future generations.*

### Economy

- More aggressive maintenance and operation of the existing transportation system
- Truck Bypass in Central County to facilitate goods movement
- Truck parking facilities
- Short haul rail improvements to reduce the number of trucks on freeways
- Grade separations
- Rehabilitation of local bridges

### Environment

- Comprehensive transit improvements to support intensified land uses and reduction of greenhouse gases:
  - Expanded Bus Rapid Transit
  - Access improvements to transit hubs
  - Dedicated contraflow lane on the San Francisco Bay Bridge connecting to the TransBay Terminal
  - Second BART TransBay tube
  - Infill BART Stations
- Dumbarton Rail, including acquisition of right-of-way for the Oakland Subdivision for both rail and other uses.
- Connectivity to High Speed Rail (ACE, BART or similar technology)
- Comprehensive network of alternative fuel stations
- Bicycle and pedestrian improvements, including completion of the Bay Trail, programs such as Safe Routes to Transit and Safe Routes to Schools, overpasses and other improvements to enhance bicycle and pedestrian safety

## Equity

- Implementation of the improvements identified in the Community Based Transportation Plans.

## **Regional Transit Expansion Program**

MTC approved Resolution 3434 on December 19, 2001 which identified a long-term, multifaceted funding strategy for directing local, regional, state and federal dollars to nearly two dozen high-priority bus, rail and ferry expansions in the nine county San Francisco Bay Area region. The most recent revisions to Resolution 3434 were adopted by the MTC Commission on September 24, 2008. The following Alameda County projects are included in Resolution 3434:

- **AC Transit Berkeley/Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit**
- **AC Transit Enhanced Bus: Hesperian/Foothill/MacArthur**
- **BART/Oakland Airport Connector**
- **Tri-Valley Access Improvements to BART**
- **BART to Warm Springs**
- **Dumbarton Rail Corridor**
- **Expanded Ferry Service to Berkeley, Alameda/Oakland/Harbor Bay**

## **FLEXIBILITY IN THE USE OF FUND SOURCES**

As shown in Table 6.8, projects are funded from a variety of sources. Under current law and practice, the CMA determines which projects receive STIP County Share funds. While the CMA also has purview over STP/CMAQ funds, the CMA assumed that federal dollars would fund maintenance of the system and MTC's regional programs.

The ITIP, also shown as one of the Tier 1 components, is under the discretion of Caltrans and the CTC. In order to give maximum flexibility to the CMA and to stretch the STIP County Share and STP/CMAQ funds, the CMA will consider substituting funds among these sources on a case-by-case basis.

**Table 6.8—Investments by Category (\$ millions)**

CATEGORY	COUNTY SHARE OF 25-YEAR STIP	PERCENT TOTAL
Additional funds for transit system maintenance	<b>275.6</b> <del>273.3</del>	<b>25</b> <del>24</del>
Freeway improvements, including HOV and local interchanges	<b>187.9</b> <del>198.9</del>	<b>17</b> <del>18</del>
Goods Movement	10.0	1
Arterial Improvements	<b>79.9</b> <del>79.6</del>	<b>7</b>
Transit Efficiency	<b>361.9</b> <del>366.7</del>	<b>33</b> <del>32</del>
TOD	<b>137.9</b> <del>159.4</del>	<b>13</b> <del>14</del>
Community Based Transportation Planning	24.9	2
Other	16.0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1094.1</b> <b><del>1,128.8</del></b>	<b>100</b>

## INVESTMENT PROGRAM AND PLANNING GOALS

The CMA's goals for the *2008 Countywide Transportation Plan* are discussed in Chapter 1 and have been identified in Table 1.1. Among the challenges facing the agencies responsible for investing public funds is to reflect public policy in those investments and to spend funds effectively. To address this challenge, the CMA has established policies and developed the investment program described above.

The CMA has proposed a CIP that mirrors its adopted goals and demonstrates a commitment to transit, to reducing congestion and pollution and to maintaining and enhancing the transportation network. Table 6.9 relates those goals to the investment program and demonstrates the vision of the Plan in "real" project and program terms. In many instances, each of these investments address multiple CMA goals as well as linking to the stated overarching goals of MTC's *Transportation 2035* of Economy, Environment and Equity.

**Table 6.9—Investment Program and Planning Goals**

#	PROJECT	IMPROVE MOBILITY	INCREASE TRANSIT USE AND ACCESS	IMPROVE AIR QUALITY	SUPPORT ECONOMIC VITALITY	ENHANCE OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY	COORDINATE LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION
<b>Multi-Area Projects</b>							
1	<b>High Priority Project</b> Telegraph/International/ E. 14th Street BRT	X	X	X		X	X
2	Maintenance Facilities Improvements				X		
3	Transit Priority Measures/ Speed Protection (includes Bay Bridge related improvements)			X		X	
4	Additional buses for Frequent Service Transit Network	X	X	X			X
5	Station Capacity Projects	X	X	X			X
6	Station Access Projects	X	X	X			X
7	Sound Wall Program				X		
8	<b>High Priority Project</b> TOD Improvement Program	X	X	X	X	X	X
9	<b>High Priority Project</b> Arterial Performance Initiative Program	X				X	
<b>Planning Area 1</b>							
10	Grand/MacArthur Bus Rapid Transit	X	X	X		X	X
11	Bridge Seismic and Safety Improvements				X		
12	I-880 Broadway/Jackson, Phase I	X			X		
13	West End Transit Hub	X	X	X	X	X	X

#	PROJECT	IMPROVE MOBILITY	INCREASE TRANSIT USE AND ACCESS	IMPROVE AIR QUALITY	SUPPORT ECONOMIC VITALITY	ENHANCE OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY	COORDINATE LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION
14	Bike and Pedestrian Improvements	X		X			
15	Gilman I-80 Interchange Improvements				X		
16	TOD Infrastructure	X	X	X	X	X	X
17	Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements	X	X	X	X		X
18	Bicycle Plan Implementation	X		X			
19	Ashby I-80 Interchange/Aquatic Park Access Improvements	X		X			
20	Berkeley Parking Pricing Program				X		
21	Railroad Crossing Improvements, Phase 1	X			X		X
22	Truck Parking facilities in North County	X			X		
23	I-880 North Improvements: SB and 66th/Hegenberger Auxiliary Lanes	X			X	X	
24	65 <sup>th</sup> Street Bike/Pedestrian Bridge at I-80, Phase 1	X		X			
25	I-80 Eastbound off-ramp at Powell Street	X			X		
26	I-880 improvement program including 42nd and High Access Improvements.	X			X		
27	Citywide ITS	X				X	



#	PROJECT	IMPROVE MOBILITY	INCREASE TRANSIT USE AND ACCESS	IMPROVE AIR QUALITY	SUPPORT ECONOMIC VITALITY	ENHANCE OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY	COORDINATE LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION
28	SMART Growth/TOD: Transit Villages at BART stations including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coliseum (replacement parking and station area improvements)</li> <li>MacArthur (replacement parking and station area improvements)</li> <li>West Oakland (replacement parking, station area improvements and bike/ped access)</li> </ul>	X	X	X	X	X	X
29	SR-24 /Caldecott Tunnel Enhancements	X				X	
30	Addition of Bike Lanes and Congestion Relief in Highland and Magnolia Ave. areas	X		X			
31	Comprehensive City Street Upgrades				X		
32	North Airport Air Cargo Access Road Improvements, Phase 1				X		
<b>Planning Area 2</b>							
33	Transfer Center at or near Chabot College	X	X	X	X	X	X
34	Crow Canyon Road Safety Improvements	X					
35	East Lewelling Boulevard Roadway Improvements	X					
36	Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvements in Cherryland/Ashland	X		X			
37	Castro Valley BART TOD	X	X	X	X	X	X

#	PROJECT	IMPROVE MOBILITY	INCREASE TRANSIT USE AND ACCESS	IMPROVE AIR QUALITY	SUPPORT ECONOMIC VITALITY	ENHANCE OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY	COORDINATE LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION
38	I-880/West A Street interchange				X		
39	South Hayward BART Transit Village	X	X	X	X	X	X
40	I-880/Industrial Parkway interchange, Phase 1				X		
41	Downtown San Leandro TOD	X	X	X	X	X	X
42	City of San Leandro Pedestrian and Streetscape Improvements	X		X			
43	E.14th St at the Hesperian Blvd/150th Avenue	X					
44	Traffic Signal System Upgrade					X	
45	Bay Fair BART Transit Village	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Planning Area 3</b>							
46	<b>High Priority Project</b> Warm Springs Extension	X	X	X	X	X	X
47	SR-262 Mission Blvd Improvements					X	
48	Automall Parkway Intersection Improvements between I-880 and I-680					X	
49	Central Avenue Railroad Overpass	X			X		
50	Dumbarton Rail Corridor	X	X	X			X
51	Union City Intermodal, Phase II	X	X	X	X	X	X
52	ACTA East West Connector (formerly SR-84) between Mission Boulevard in Union City and I-880 in Fremont	X	X				X

#	PROJECT	IMPROVE MOBILITY	INCREASE TRANSIT USE AND ACCESS	IMPROVE AIR QUALITY	SUPPORT ECONOMIC VITALITY	ENHANCE OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY	COORDINATE LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION
<b>Planning Area 4</b>							
53	<b>High Priority Project</b> I-580 Corridor Improvements						
	▪ HOT Lanes	X	X	X	X	X	
	▪ Auxiliary lanes at Isabel						
	▪ Right-of-way preservation for transit						
54	SR-84 widening, Jack London to Vallecitos	X					
55	Vasco Road Safety Improvements Phase II	X					
56	Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements on Stanley Blvd	X		X			
57	Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements on Alamo Canal Trail	X		X			
58	Dublin Interchange Improvements, (Hacienda and Fallon Road) Phase II					X	
59	Project Development for I-580/680 Connector					X	
60	I-580/First Street interchange improvement to ultimate configuration					X	
61	I-580/Vasco Road interchange improvement to ultimate configuration					X	
62	Isabel Avenue/I-580 interchange Phase II					X	

#	PROJECT	IMPROVE MOBILITY	INCREASE TRANSIT USE AND ACCESS	IMPROVE AIR QUALITY	SUPPORT ECONOMIC VITALITY	ENHANCE OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY	COORDINATE LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION
63	PSR Development for SR-84 widening. Pigeon Pass to I-680	X					
64	Livermore/Dublin Bus Rapid Transit Project	X	X	X		X	X

## IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

The timing of the funding of each project will be determined by the “Programming Cycle,” either state or federal. Each funding program has its own specific requirements for the type of project that is eligible to receive funds. Projects must meet the general eligibility criteria of each funding program. Projects must also be within the dollar amount shown in the *Countywide Transportation Plan*. The CMA will determine plan conformity based on the **year-of-expenditure 2004** dollar values shown in this Plan. Projects will also be subject to the “Timely Use of Funds Policy” and other policies, as appropriate, adopted by the CMA Board.

## **SUMMARY OF INVESTMENT PROGRAM**

The CMA will use the following policies to address funding the Tier 1 and Tier 2 investment program.

- The CMA will consider substituting funds on a case-by-case basis among STIP County Share and STP/CMAQ funds to provide maximum flexibility.
- Resources will be focused on five high priority projects over the next several state and federal funding cycles to ensure delivery of these projects. High priority projects are those projects that provide congestion relief, improve mobility and/or connectivity that extend beyond a single area.
- Request designation of corridor status combining corridor improvements. Corridor status allows the CMA to pool funding programmed in a corridor and provides flexibility to move funding between various phases of corridor improvements.